

# Non-TMDL Report Peer Review Form

*Use for all reports that aren't TMDLs*

*May also use this form, on a case-by-case basis, for progress reports, posters, web content, online data systems, and other media that disseminate environmental data or data assessments.*

<b>Title of report:</b>	
Author:	
Manager of author's section:	
Manager of reviewing section:	
Peer reviewer (determined by manager of reviewing section)	

***Date completed***

Author emails a link to the draft report and this review form to the assigned peer reviewer and the unit supervisors for both the peer reviewer and author. On this email, cc all section managers (Will, Tom, Bob).	
--	--

Date review is due to author (usually 3 weeks from date author sent initial draft): \_\_\_\_\_

**Peer reviewer:** Please complete the following as you review the report. Your review may be tailored to the size and complexity of the project.

1. **Technical Quality** – Does the report as a whole stand together? Are the conclusions supported by the methods, analysis, and results? Are there errors of fact or interpretation? Are any ideas overemphasized or underemphasized?
2. **Readability and Conciseness** - Should some sections of the manuscript be expanded, condensed, or omitted? Is any content repeated or duplicated, including repetition in the text of data in tables or figures? Are the author's statements clear, or if not, how can clarity be achieved?
3. **Abstract** - Does it state the purpose of the document? Does it describe the study and summarize pertinent results and conclusions? Is it descriptive for both technical readers and general public? Abstract should not exceed 300 words.
4. **Introduction** - Does it clearly describe the purpose of the document and present pertinent

background information, including project setting, suspected problems and sources, and the results of previous studies and monitoring?

5. **Methods** - Were appropriate techniques used in the study? Are the methods adequately described, including study design, monitoring procedures, data quality procedures, and analytical procedures?
6. **Results and Discussion** - Are the data and analysis appropriate to meet the study objectives? Are data quality results adequately reported? Is the analysis focused on relevant trends, patterns, relationships, and anomalies? Are comparisons to other data, applicable criteria, and standards appropriate?
7. **Illustrations and Tables** - Are all necessary? Do they clearly present basic information and emphasize relationships? Are the form and arrangement of illustrations and tables satisfactory? Are there ways to improve hard-to-read table or illustrations, or to combine them for conciseness?
8. **Conclusions** - Do the conclusions concisely summarize the principal findings or recommendations? Are the conclusions sound and properly documented?
9. **Recommendations** – Are the recommendations reasonable and supported by the study results? Do the recommendations address both actions and monitoring?
10. **References** - Are all references cited in the text included in this section? Are they cited correctly? Were all the pertinent references, and only the pertinent references, cited in the document?

*(continued on next page)*

**Additional comments or significant concerns that need to be addressed in a revised report:**

**(Peer Reviewer:** Both here and for specific comments marked within the reviewed QAPP, please strive to differentiate between comments/concerns that are significant and threaten study integrity vs. those that are for the author's consideration and discretion. This will assist the author with addressing your comments.)

**Peer reviewer determination** (select 1 or 2 below):

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. **Report is acceptable** as is or with minor revisions as noted above in comments section.  
No further review is required.

*Enter date when completed:*

*Date:*

Peer reviewer emails this form (and a link to marked-up draft report if necessary) to author, with cc's to the unit supervisors of the peer reviewer and author.	
--	--

- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. **Report needs to be revised** and reviewed again. The report should be revised and returned to the peer reviewer along with a response to significant concerns identified above.

*Enter date when each step is completed:*

*Date:*

Peer reviewer emails this form (and a link to marked-up draft report if necessary) to author, with cc's to the unit supervisors of the peer reviewer and author.	
Author revises report per the comments above, and prepares a brief response summary indicating how the reviewer's significant concerns were addressed. If you don't agree with the peer reviewer's comments, discuss them with the peer reviewer; if no resolution, discuss with your supervisor.	
Author emails a link to revised report, response summary, and this form to peer reviewer, with cc's to unit supervisors of the peer reviewer and author.	
Peer reviewer emails author when report is technically adequate, with cc's to unit supervisors of the peer reviewer and author.	
Author's supervisor signs, indicating the peer review process was followed and substantive issues resolved:  _____	

*After this form is completed, the project lead will file it with the project files.*